

of leading U.S. foreign policy experts, think tanks, and government studies have concluded that unilateral sanctions are costly and counter-productive, particularly in a global economy, where technology, capital equipment, financing, and farm commodities are freely available from U.S. competitors.

Last year, the Glenn Amendment, which required the President to impose sanctions in response to India and Pakistan's nuclear tests, showed the weakness of relying on unilateral sanctions as an all-purpose foreign policy tool. The threat of sanctions, which were U.S. law prior to the testing, failed to deter India or Pakistan from conducting their tests, but would have cost the United States a major wheat sale if Congress had not intervened last year to grant the President waiver authority.

The legislation I am introducing today seeks responsible reform of the decision making process associated with U.S. unilateral sanctions. The bill's primary goal is to ensure that Congress and the Administration have better information for more informed decision-making on sanctions bills and initiatives.

Before imposing a unilateral sanction, the bill requires Congress and the President to request relevant information and address certain common-sense questions. Among them are the following. Is the proposed unilateral sanction likely to be effective? Is the sanction aimed at a clearly-defined and realistic objective? What are the economic costs for American industry and agriculture? Will the sanction undermine other U.S. security, foreign policy, and humanitarian objectives, such as relations with our key U.S. allies? Have potential alternatives, such as multilateral sanctions or diplomatic initiatives, been tried and failed?

My colleagues and I who are sponsoring this legislation today intend to work quickly to move the legislation through the legislative process. Without the information that this bill would provide us about future sanctions, we risk taking action that is not in our interest and has a very small chance of success. This bill is about establishing effective procedures that will lead to effective results in the way we respond to behavior by nations with which we have concerns. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO BURLINGTON COUNTY
FIRST ASSISTANT PROSECUTOR
MICHAEL E. RILEY

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 19, 1999, the County of Burlington in New Jersey lost a dedicated public servant. Someone who has tirelessly fought for justice, the rights of victims, and heightened the awareness of domestic violence, Michael E. Riley will truly be missed.

After 19 years of public service to Burlington County, Mike Riley has stepped down as First Assistant Prosecutor to enter private practice. During his tenure, Mike became well known as one of New Jersey's most respected trial attorneys. Described as the most experienced

prosecutor in New Jersey, Mike successfully prosecuted nine capital murder cases, never losing a single homicide case, the most in Burlington County history.

Outside of the courtroom, Mike was involved with many important civic groups. Mike was Co-Chair of the first Domestic Violence Working Group and was the first Director of the Burlington County Narcotic Task Force. Additionally, Mike shared his experience and expertise with others. He served as an adjunct professor at Widener Law School for 10 years and has served on the faculty of Monmouth College and Burlington County College.

Many accolades can be bestowed upon Michael E. Riley, but I think the most honored one was summed up by a colleague when he stated that Mike "can't be replaced." This truly demonstrates the respect that Mike has among his peers.

On behalf of the people of Burlington county, I thank Michael E. Riley for his dedicated service to the County of Burlington and wish him well in his future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO JUDY KENNEDY

HON. HEATHER WILSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to your attention the dedicated service of Judy Kennedy who recently retired after 18 years of service at the Juvenile Detention Center in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Judy Kennedy was a teacher and Education Director at the Juvenile Detention Center. Ms. Kennedy's career has many milestones including American Correctional Association certification, expansion of classrooms, additions for special education services, drug and alcohol education just to name a few. She worked to establish the Continuation School for kids who cannot return to regular schools due to their history of suspension or expulsion. Ms. Kennedy recognized that these kids are part of our community, and that we need to give them a chance to be contributing members of our community. She worked with kids that others would consider "throwaways."

Ms. Kennedy touched the lives of many children. It has been sighted in many articles about at-risk kids, "one of the most important factors in changing their lives is a caring adult." Judy Kennedy is that caring adult.

TRIBUTE TO ALFRED GINSBURG

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Alfred "Al" Ginsburg on his retirement from the Madera County Board of Supervisors. Supervisor Ginsburg has served the Board of Supervisors for 24 years.

Al Ginsburg is a native Californian born in Tulare County. The Ginsburg family then moved on to Chowchilla where Al attended

Chowchilla elementary schools and Chowchilla High School. Al then graduated from Fresno State College, now known as California State University, Fresno, with a degree in business administration. From 1948 to 1950 Al owned and operated a family shoe store, but in 1950 he became a full time farmer, this was before his interest in government brought him into the political arena.

Al Ginsburg has served the people of Madera County in many capacities, serving as an elected leader and devoting his time to community service. Al served as a member of the Chowchilla city council for 16 years, several times during the 16 years, he held the position of Mayor. He also served on the Chowchilla High School Board for 10 years and served as a member of the Madera County Civil Service Commission for 12 years. Al was also a member of the Local Agency Formation Commission and the Local Transportation Commission and Authority.

During his time on the Madera County Board of Supervisors, Al has taken on numerous tasks. Al served as a member of the County Supervisors Association of California, CSAC, and presently serves as a member of the Board of Directors. Al is a current member of the CSAC Public Finance and Operations Policy Committee. He has also been a member of the Regional Council of Rural Counties Board of Directors. A resident of Madera County for 67 years, Al Ginsburg is in his sixth term as a Member of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Al Ginsburg on the occasion of his retirement from the Madera County Board of Supervisors. Al Ginsburg leaves behind a proud legacy of community service. I urge my colleagues to join me in wishing Al Ginsburg many years of continued success.

TRIBUTE TO BAY VIEW HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TEAM

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, it is with immense pride and pleasure that I rise to congratulate the students, parents, teachers and faculty who contributed to the championship season recorded by the Bay View High School (BVHS) debate team in the Wisconsin High School Forensic Association's (WHSFA) annual State Debate Tournament held at UW-Oshkosh on January 28th and 29th.

I applaud the efforts of affirmatives Kimberly Malak and Robert Croston, and negatives Benita Anderson and Corey Scott for their wonderful individual and team accomplishments.

Additionally, the affirmative team shares the honor of an undefeated record with the affirmative team from Cedarburg. Both finished with 7-0 records. Bay View's winning score was 12 wins and two losses. Other Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS) teams participating at the tournament were Rufus King High School, which placed 4th overall, and Juneau Business High School.

The 1998–99 season for the Bay View High School debate team was historic. The varsity team won an invitational tournament held at Sheboygan South High School for the first time since 1995. The team also successfully defended its 1997 City Championship First Place Trophy on December 11, 1998. After qualifying at the district debates for participating in the WHSFA State Tournament earlier in January, the Bay View team was matched against others from across the state in what many consider the premier debate tournament of the year.

The team has been coached by Mr. Ray Lane since the 1995–96 season. Mr. Daemien Morscher, a 1993 BVHS graduate, National Merit Scholar, and former member of the debate team, is serving as assistant coach. Other members of the team include Daniel Brandt, Kenneth Dunbeck, Steven Finch, Matt Hickling, Leonard Wilson, Robert Woodliff, and Winston Woods. Ben Silver also participated in some tournaments.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to salute the talent and commitment of the Bay View High School debate team on its outstanding season, which I bring before you in commendation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to an article printed in the March edition of the Labor Party Press.

[From the Labor Party Press, Mar. 1999]

DON'T BLOW AWAY SOCIAL SECURITY

SOCIAL SECURITY BASICS

Under Social Security, workers contribute a certain amount of their pay into the system through their work life. They then earn entitlement to family benefits when they retire, become disabled, or die.

Social Security is funded through payroll taxes (FICA, or Federal Insurance Contribution Act) on both the employee and employer. Currently each pays 6.2 percent on all wages and salaries up to a maximum of \$68,400 in income. The payroll taxes we pay today finance the benefits for today's retirees. From the money we contribute, the government writes Social Security checks and mails them to beneficiaries.

Any extra money collected through payroll taxes goes into a Social Security Trust Fund. Until the 1990s, the Social Security Trust Fund was relatively small. However, it has ballooned in size in the past decade—and in fact has helped create the much celebrated "balanced budget."

Some 44 million Americans receive benefits from Social Security. Thirty million of these are the elderly and their dependents, 6 million are the disabled and their dependents, and 7 million are the survivors of deceased workers.

About 92 percent of people over 65 receive Social Security benefits. Since 1935, when the labor movement helped force passage of Social Security, the program has dramatically reduced poverty among the elderly and disabled. Unfortunately, though, some people who really need it—like farmworkers—still aren't entitled to Social Security.

WHAT'S GOOD ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

Social Security has dramatically cut poverty among the elderly and disabled. While about 12 percent of seniors currently live in poverty, without Social Security, 42 percent would be poor. About two-thirds of the elderly rely on Social Security to provide over half their retirement income. Social Security is especially essential since the U.S. does not require employers to provide pensions.

Social Security is progressive. Those who have been paid high salaries throughout their lives will get a much smaller percentage of their salary replaced by Social Security than those who have worked all their lives in low-wage jobs. An average wage-earner retiring in 1997 will get back about 44 percent of his or her earnings from Social Security. A high wage-earner gets back about 25 percent. And a low wage-earner gets about 80 percent.

Social Security benefits just about everyone. About 92 percent of people over 65 get Social Security. It's a program that working-class, middle-class, and poor people can all get behind.

Social Security is efficient. Because it is run entirely by the federal government, puts all the money into one pool and invests it in one place. Social Security only spends about one percent of benefits on administration.

WHAT OTHER COUNTRIES DO BETTER

All seven major industrialized countries (Japan, Canada, United Kingdom, U.S., Germany, France, and Italy) have systems that are, like ours, pay-as-you-go. Today's workers support today's retirees.

Italy, Germany, and France spend 12–14 percent of their gross domestic product to support retirees. The U.S. spends 6.9 percent. Japan, Canada, and the UK pay slightly less than us.

In the U.S., the average-earning worker can expect to get 42–44 percent of his or her income replaced on retirement. In Germany, France, and Italy the rate is 50 percent.

In the U.S., Germany, and Japan, retirement age is now 65. It's lower in France, Italy, and Canada. In the U.K., it's 65 for men and 60 for women. (The U.S. retirement age is slated to go up to 67 for people born after 1960.)

All the industrialized countries have programs to cover the healthcare costs of retirees, but American retirees have to pay more out of their pockets than seniors in the other six countries. Today, U.S. seniors pay a third of their medical costs themselves.

WHAT WE SHOULD DO ABOUT SOCIAL SECURITY

The Social Security system is quite sound, and with only minor modifications, it should stay that way. We don't have to institute privatization, raise the retirement age, cut benefits, reformulate the cost-of-living index, or increase the payroll tax on workers to "save" Social Security.

One modest and relatively painless change to Social Security would wipe out a big chunk of the shortfall that some are projecting: Eliminate the payroll-tax earning cap. Currently, the Social Security payroll tax is not paid on wages in excess of \$68,400. Since the ranks of the very rich, have been growing, this has resulted in something of a drain on Social Security. In the early 1980s, 90 percent of all wages fell under the threshold. Now it's 87 percent, and it's expected to drop to 85 percent. Why not make it 100 percent?

Says economist Dean Baker: "If you eliminate the cap altogether, it would wipe out about three-quarters of the projected Social

Security shortfall. The amount that will be paid out in Social Security benefits won't be that much more than before, because it's a progressive pay-out structure. Someone who earned a million or two in their lifetime might only get an annual Social Security payment of \$50,000, say."

Another proposal the Labor Party has suggested: raise the payroll tax on employers—but not workers. Workers have seen a net drain on their incomes for the past couple of decades, and this would be one way to begin to tip the balance in the other direction.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PENALTIES FOR FALSE REPORTING AND INACCURATE ROYALTY PAYMENTS ON FEDERAL OIL AND GAS LEASES

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1999

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers are being systematically cheated out of hundreds of millions of dollars by oil companies that do not pay the correct amount of royalties on the oil and gas they produce from public lands.

We can see evidence of this fraudulent behavior in several Congressional investigations, the Department of Justice litigation and a Clinton Administration Interagency Task Force report. Additionally, the Justice Department intervened in 8 of 19 qui tam cases filed by private individuals alleging hundreds of millions of dollars underpaid to the federal government. One company (Mobil) has settled with the federal government for \$45 million. In addition, States (including Alaska, California, Alabama, Louisiana and Texas) have brought similar lawsuits that have been settled for almost \$3 billion. The Interior Department is collecting more than \$275 million on underpayments.

To correct the underlying problem, the Department of the Interior has tried—unsuccessfully—for the past three years to revise its rules to make it more difficult for oil producers to avoid paying accurate royalties. The proposed regulations would clarify long standing legal requirements requiring the industry's responsibility to pay the cost of marketing the public's oil and gas. But some oil producers have been systematically deducting those costs from the amounts they owe taxpayers. Under the new rules, these producers would be required to pay the correct amount—based on real-market sales—to the American people who own the oil and gas.

Instead of supporting this necessary corrective action, however, Congress has enacted legislative riders preventing the implementation of the new rules at a cost of more than \$60 million a year, most of which would go to fund public education. The Senate is poised to extend this travesty on the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, and the House is expected to go along in Conference Committee. Taxpayers should be distressed that Congress would rather side with industry rather than assure fair market value on the public's natural resources.